

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to all of the claims now in the application (i.e., Claims 15-36) is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, by this Amendment, Claims 1-14 have been cancelled and new Claims 15-36 have been substituted in their place in order to resolve the 112 rejection and to better clarify the novel features of the invention over the cited art. In particular, two sets of claims have been added-namely Claims 15-25 which refer to the flyscreen assembly associated with a door and Claims 26-36 which refer to the flyscreen assembly associated with a window. The two sets of claims are otherwise identical. The claims have also been amended to remove the alternative language and the improper English as more specifically recited in paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

In addition to the foregoing, independent Claims 15 and 26 incorporate the subject matter of portions of former Claims 1 and Claim 2, the recited alternative limitations in original Claim 1 now being set forth in Claims 16, 17, 18, and 27, 28, and 29, respectively. Claims 19-23 and Claims 30-34 each correspond respectively to former Claims 4-7 and Claims 24 and 25, as well as Claims 35 and 36, each incorporate portions of former Claim 8. As amended, it is believed that the various 112 objections have been resolved.

Additionally, Applicant hereby requests a two month extension of time in which to respond to the outstanding Office Action. PTO Form 2038 in the amount of two

hundred and twenty three dollars (\$223.00) is enclosed herewith to cover the official filing fee for two (2) additional claims (\$18.00) as well as the two month extension of time (\$205.00). The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee deficiency to Deposit Account No. 07-0130.

Turning now to the 102 and 103 rejections of the claims as being either anticipated or rendered obvious by Kissinger, it is respectfully submitted that this reference neither discloses nor suggests the invention as now claimed. Kissinger does not disclose or suggest brushes associated with a jamb defining one lateral side of the opening of the door/window. In Kissinger, the brushes 35, 36 are disposed in a horizontal channel above the door/flyscreen and only contact the upper and lower edges of the screen panel 15. Specifically, brushes 35, 36 are in a horizontal track or channel 28 above and below the door/flyscreen. There is no brush on the sliding flyscreen frame itself and especially not on any trailing jamb of the flyscreen frame (as presently claimed) since Kissinger does not have a trailing jamb-it has only a leading jamb since it relates to a roller blind screen rather than a sliding frame screen, as presently claimed. Accordingly, Kissinger does not have a slidable frame, does not have a trailing edge jamb, does not have any brush on the sliding frame, let alone a jamb of the sliding frame or even specifically an edge of a trailing jamb of the slidable frame, as presently claimed. Kissinger has only opposing brushes in fixed opposing relationship to each other extending along the horizontal tracks in which the fly screen runs.

The apparatus of the present invention allows for the first time a compact and efficient system incorporating a slidable frame flyscreen that when fully extended across the opening of the door or window prevents inset ingress between the trailing edge jamb of the flyscreen frame and the static pane/panel of the window or door and which further is effective to prevent ingress at that area even when the slidable frame is only partly drawn across the opening. There is nothing in the cited Kissinger patent or, indeed, any of the cited prior art that teaches anything towards this claimed invention. The configuration and arrangement of the claimed flyscreen assembly is completely different from that shown in Kissinger, as noted above.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now in the application are patentably distinguishable over the cited references either applied alone or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

CONRAD PETER MARTIN



Thomas M. Galgano, (27,638)
GALGANO & BURKE
Attorneys for Applicant
300 Rabro Drive, Suite 135
Hauppauge, NY 11788
(631) 582-6161

TMG/jgg

Enclosures: PTO Form 2030 in the amount of \$18.00
Postcard

F:\G&B\1182\44\amendment.wpd